

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 11, 20 and 21 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schickerling (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,420).

Claim 20 has been amended. Claim 20 further defines that the cam member is spaced from the clamp such that the cam member functions independently of the clamp.

The Schickerling reference cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or illustrate Applicants' claims. Schickerling illustrates a clamping device 80 which includes a clamping foot 58. As best illustrated in Figure 7, the clamp arm 84 is rotated to assert a force onto the plate 58 which, in turn, clamps the blade 24 in position. Thus, the "cam member" alleged by the Examiner is neither spaced nor acts independently of the clamp. The plate 58 is an integral part of the clamp mechanism. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 20 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) alleging them to be unpatentable over Lai (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,709) in view of Schickerling. The Examiner alleges that the combination illustrates Applicants' invention.

Claims 1 and 11 further define the flat planar monolithic one piece carrier to have a first portion and a second portion. The first portion includes a planar base and sidewalls extending from and continuous with the planar base. Also, the second portion is continuous with the first portion to form the one piece carrier. The combination cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or illustrate Applicants' claims. The Examiner alleges in his remarks that:

"Lai does not disclose a monolithic carrier with side walls extending from and continuous with the base. However, Schickerling teaches monolithic carrier 40, 42, 44 with side walls 40, 42 extending from and continuous with the base 44."

The Examiner is misapplying Schickerling. Schickerling neither discloses nor illustrates a monolithic carrier as claimed by Applicants. In column 2, lines 28-36, Schickerling states as follows:

Referring to FIG. 1, the blade clamp assembly of the present invention, generally designated 10, is adapted to mount a blade, generally designated 12, to the reciprocating plunger (not shown) of a known type. It will be understood that the plunger forms part of a power operated, reciprocating saw, often referred to as a Recipro saw or Saber saw. The plunger can be of any known construction terminating at an outer end to which the blade clamp assembly 10 is connected.

Likewise, Schickerling further details the connection of the blade holder assembly 10 with a plunger via the bore 30. This is illustrated in Column 2, lines 44-52, which states as follows:

The blade holder assembly 10 includes a housing 28 adapted to be secured to the plunger. In this respect, the housing 28 includes a bore 30 formed at end 32 of the housing 28 in coaxial alignment with a threaded bore (not shown) formed in the plunger. In a known fashion, a fastener (not shown) passes through the bore 30 and threadingly engages the bore found on the plunger to secure the housing 28 to the plunger. Other known methods can be used to connect the assembly 10 to the plunger.

Accordingly, the Schickerling reference is attached to a plunger or carrier, as claimed by Applicants. It is not monolithic nor would it be considered as such. The Schickerling device is a substitute for the device 10 of the Lai reference. Thus, it is still bolted on the carrier and is not monolithic, as claimed by Applicants.

Thus, the Examiner's combination fails to disclose or illustrate Applicants' claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 and 11, as well as their dependent claims, to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9, 10, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the above combination further in view of Armstrong (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,520). The combination with Armstrong fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Examiner's Lai and Schickerling combination. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 9, 10, 18 and 19 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai and Schickerling further in view of Armstrong.

Claim 21 has been amended. Claim 21 further defines the first pair of lateral rails to be integrally formed on the housing and extending from the housing. The Examiner's combination fails to disclose or illustrate such a feature. The Examiner's combination illustrates a connector member which is bolted onto the housing. The combination fails to disclose the lateral rails integrally formed on the housing. Thus, Applicants believe Claims 21-23 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience.
Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should
not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2007

By:


W. R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/lkj